

Date of decision: 27.11.1995

For approval and signature

The Honourable Mr. Justice S. M. Soni

and

The Honourable Mr. Justice R. R. Jain

Mrs. Sudha Gangwar, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. B.G. Jani and Mr. S.N. Shelat, advocates for respondents.

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of judgment?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

Coram: S.M. Soni & R.R. Jain, JJ.

-----

November 27, 1995.

Oral judgment (Per Soni, J.)

Learned advocates for the parties are absent.

According to the petitioner, respondents have committed breach of the order by not complying or committing breach of the order passed by this Court. The relevant portion of the impugned order reads as under:

"In the meantime, the status quo existing as on today qua

the petitioner will continue upto 27.1.89, subject to the rider that because of the status quo order, the petitioner will not be permitted to operate the Bank Accounts of the Union or to take any steps as President which may bind the Union."

There is nothing on record to show that the said interim relief had continued beyond 27.1.1989. There is nothing even in the petition to show as to how is the breach committed by the respondents. When the allegation is vague and in the absence of specific allegation showing the breach of the order, this court would not like to take cognizance of only statement of breach. Hence, the petitioner has failed to make out the case falling under clause (c) of Section 2 of the Contempt of Courts Act. Hence, the petition deserves to be dismissed and is hereby dismissed. Rule discharged. No costs.